

REMARKS:

Claims 18, 19, 21-27, and 30-37 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 18, 19, 21-27, 30-34, 36, and 37 are cancelled and claims 38-55 are added, thereby leaving claim 35 unchanged.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of claim 35.

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the time required to prepare for and conduct the telephone interview that occurred on July 27, 2006. During the interview, at least some of the new claims added by this Amendment were discussed and the cited references were discussed. The Examiner indicated that she will consider the new claims when filed with a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, Applicant files herewith a Request for Continued Examination.

New claims 38-46

Independent claim 38 recites:

A method of making a badge comprising:
providing a card having a front surface and a back surface;
adhering a backing to the back surface of the card;
cutting only the card into segments and not the backing;
providing a card printer;
feeding the cut card and the backing into the card printer;
forming an image on the front surface of the card after cutting the card; and
removing the cut card with the image on the front surface from the backing.

None of the cited references teach or suggest feeding a cut card into a card printer and forming an image on the front surface of the card after cutting the card. Some cited references do not teach printing. For those references that do teach printing, they teach printing on a web prior to cutting the web. Accordingly, the cited references do not teach or suggest these limitations of independent claim 38.

In addition, none of the references of record teach or suggest, among other things, a card and a card printer. The Examiner has not appropriately considered the claim limitations of a "card" and a "card printer". The Examiner attempts to interpret both Scholz et al. and Freeman to include both a card and a card printer, when in fact, Scholz et al. and Freeman disclose a web and a web printer. Those of ordinary skill in the art understand a difference between a web and a card and a difference between a web printer and a card printer. In other words, the terms card and card

printer actually have meaning in the badge forming and printing arts. In practice, a card cannot be fed through a web printer and similarly a web cannot be fed through a card printer. Card printers are designed to receive cards and web printers are designed to receive webs. Accordingly, these terms are not interchangeable as the Examiner is attempting to do in the interpretation of Scholz et al. and Freeman.

For these reasons and others, the cited references do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 38. Accordingly, independent claim 38 is allowable. Claims 39-46 depend from independent claim 38 and are allowable for the same and other reasons as independent claim 38.

New claims 47-55

Independent claim 47 recites:

A combination comprising:
a printing medium including
 a card having a front surface and a back surface, and
 a backing removably adhered to the back surface of the card, the
 card being cut into segments with the backing adhered thereto and the
 backing not being cut; and
a card printer, the cut card and the backing being fed into the card printer
and the card printer capable of printing an image on the front surface of the cut
card.

None of the cited references teach or suggest, among other things, a cut card and a backing being fed into a card printer. As mentioned above, some of the references do not teach printing and those references that do teach printing teach printing on a web of material prior to cutting the web.

In addition, none of the cited references teach or suggest a card and a card printer. For the same reasons discussed above, the cited references, and particularly Scholz et al. and Freeman, do not teach or suggest a card and a card printer.

For these and other reasons, the cited references do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 47. Accordingly, independent claim 47 is allowable. Claims 48-55 depend from independent claim 47 and are allowable for the same and other reasons as independent claim 47.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of the present RCE and Amendment, and allowance of claims 35 and 38-55 are respectfully requested.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

Dated: August 14, 2006

By: 

Charles A. Laff, Reg. No. 19,787

Paul M. McGinley, Reg. No. 55,443

180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000

Chicago, Illinois 60601

Phone: (312) 222-0800

Fax: (312) 222-0818

Atty Docket No. 200920-9007